



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which the United States acquired its title to Oregon (p. 150). His own wilderness experience enables him to point out the absurd equipment of Pike (pp. 181, 186) and of Long (p. 226) for their tasks.

Amid much that is excellent one regrets the presence of many inaccuracies: San Antonio was not founded in 1692 (p. 134), Crozat did not receive his grant two years after New Orleans was founded (p. 138), the Treaty of 1783 did not limit the United States "to the mouth of the Yazoo" (p. 144), West Florida was not seized in 1812 (map, p. 154), the forces of Malgares in 1806 did not go "as far as the Sabine" (p. 181), and Natchitoches (not "Nachitoches") was not a "Spanish post in Texas".

Other expressions may be classed as erroneous because they state as definite, matters that are far from certain. Among these are the identification of the Espiritu Santo of Piñeda as the Mississippi, and the placing of its discovery before 1510 (p. 104); the identification of the River of the Palms as the Rio Grande, and of the mysterious western river mentioned by the Indians to the French as the Columbia (p. 133); and the vague statement that Iberville's settlement in 1699 was "near the mouth of the Mississippi" (p. 134). The varying assertions (pp. 155, 157, 160) of the relation between the expedition of Lewis and Clark and the Louisiana Purchase are misleading. The extract from Jefferson's instructions (p. 161) relates to the Indians, although Freeman, in 1806, made use of similar powers when threatened by the Spaniards. The name of the English trader "Haney" (p. 163) is given by Thwaites as "Henney". The text (p. 178) would seem to imply that Pike was selected by Jefferson for his exploration; but Wilkinson was responsible for this choice.

Barring the deficiencies which mar its critical value, Mr. Dellenbaugh has produced a fairly satisfactory work and one that from its excellent typography and abundant illustration should prove deservedly successful in arousing general interest in his subject. An index and numerous references to the more popular sources add to its value.

ISAAC JOSLIN COX.

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789. Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts. Vol. I., 1774; Vol. II., 1775, May 10—September 20; Vol. III. 1775, September 21—December 30. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1904, 1905, 1905. Pp. 143, 1-256, 257-538.)

A DOCUMENTARY series of such fundamental importance to our history as the journals of the Continental Congress ought long since to have been set before the historical and general public in its integrity and in a worthy form. It has long been known that the contemporary printed editions and, without the same excuse on grounds of public safety, the reprints of 1800 and 1823, were very far from complete; and certainly the last-named, the edition commonly used, was not in respect

to appearance a thing to be proud of. Now that the original manuscripts have been transferred to the Library of Congress, Mr. Ford comes forward with the beginnings of an edition which may fairly be called definitive. If it is not in all respects a model of what such a publication should be (and in nearly all respects it is), it certainly is in all ways worthy of a great governmental establishment and of a body of material hardly equalled in its significance for the history of the United States.

Mr. Ford prints on light paper and in large type. The number of pages in a volume is, it will be seen, not large. Unless the years 1774 and 1775 are not typical with respect to additions to the old text, the completion of the record will require nearly forty such volumes. Additions to the old text are very numerous, and sometimes of much importance. In one place, a week's transactions in Congress have left hardly any trace on the journals as formerly printed. In another (II. 218), an interesting series of resolutions regarding saltpetre, though absent even from the manuscript of the journals, has been recovered from a pamphlet printed by authority of Congress. The editor by no means contents himself with the mere text of the original manuscript journals, but when reports or documents prepared by committees are mentioned there, he inserts them from the papers of the Old Congress, the contemporary newspapers or other sources. Much of the most valuable editorial comment consists of learned notes on these documents. In some cases, where various drafts of them are extant, these are presented *seriatim*. A particularly interesting example is that of the Declaration on taking up Arms (II. 128-157). At the end of Vol. III. John Adams's notes of debates from September 23 to October 30, 1775, are presented. Valuable and illuminating as these are, it seems an anomaly to include them without making use of other extant diaries. Vol. I. contains several photographic facsimiles of important documents. At the end of Vols. I. and III. a bibliography of the printed pieces issued by Congress is presented; also an excellent index.

Much as one must admire this monumental work, it has several blemishes. In the first place, such a publication should, according to all the best modern practice, begin with a full and critical account of the manuscript sources whence it is derived. Mr. Ford's very meagre preface to Vol. I. contains nothing of the sort, and if some fragments of information on the subject are presented in the preface to Vol. II., they are inadequate, and not always clearly expressed. We are informed (III. 515) that general remarks on the printed editions are postponed to the end of the series. Perhaps the same is true of the manuscripts. Meanwhile readers may like to know—a fact not mentioned in these volumes—that an elaborate account of the manuscripts was presented by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, Vol. XXI. Another important desideratum is a complete list of members of Congress in at least the two years 1774 and 1775. Such a list, general or special, should have been prefixed either to the whole work or to each volume. Thirdly, while there is much use of erased type, it

is not clear, at any rate to the present reviewer, just what it indicates. Finally, there is a decided infelicity in the half-separate, half-united condition of Vols. II. and III. They have one preface, one pagination, one bibliographical appendix, one index; and the phrase "this volume" in the preface and elsewhere in Vol. II. (II. 253) is used in a sense that includes both. Yet they have separate title-pages and are bound as two volumes. If there has been hesitation between two plans of arrangement, it is to be hoped that hereafter the unit will be the volume and not the calendar year; to make the latter the unit for indexing, it is certain, would cause much trouble to the multitude of students who will hereafter use this splendid work.

The Civil Service and the Patronage. By CARL RUSSELL FISH, Assistant Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. [Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. XI.] (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1905. Pp. xi, 280.)

THE recent work of Mr. Fish is the most important and valuable contribution that has been made to the history of the civil service in this country. The function of the historian is not simply to enumerate facts in a chronological order, but through these facts to interpret the spirit of an age. Any trained student with an accurate mind and sufficient time can count the number of removals from office made by all the presidents from Washington to Roosevelt, but it is the work of the historian, as differentiated from that of the investigator, to show through these removals the development of a complex system and to associate these removals with other events apparently unconnected with them. It is in this that the chief merit of Mr. Fish's work consists. The book, moreover, is interesting, and it is therefore a welcome illustration of the principle urged by a growing number of historians that a history may be thoroughly scientific and yet not be so dull that "it can be read only by the author and the proof-reader."

The book falls naturally into four parts: the first deals with the history of appointments and removals down to the administration of President Jackson, the second treats of the genesis of the spoils system, the third part considers the struggle between the spoils system and its foes, while the fourth is a frank exposition of the difficulties inherent in any mechanical system of selecting officers.

The first part contains little in effect that is new. Additional facts have been gleaned in regard to well-known cases of removal; the number of removals in every administration prior to that of President Jackson is shown to be greater than has generally been thought, while it is also made clear that more of these removals were apparently made for political reasons than had been supposed to be the case. Yet while the investigation of all of these points has given a broader basis for conclusions, it is a question whether it has really altered the conclusions previously drawn in regard to the early period. The one disputed question of the period has been whether President Jefferson introduced